

MD iMap Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Place: Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE): Terra Conference Room (Baltimore, Maryland)

Date: 03/02/10

Time: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Attendees: Graham Petto (MDP), Julia Lukens (DBED), Marshall Stevenson (Frederick County), Brad Spittel (BMC), Mark Helmken (CGIS), Ashley Buzzeo (CGIS), Kevin Boone (DNR), Bill Fearington (DJS), Brad Wolters (DHCD), Virginia Peterman (Howard County), Mike Roosa (MSP), Julie Spangler (MD Poison Center) and Brooks Weaver (MES).

Summary: *The following minutes cover the notes that were taken during the MD iMap Technical Committee meeting that was held at location, date and time period noted above. This document is published for reference purposes only, and any questions as to its contents must be directed to either the Maryland State Geographic Information Officer (GIO) or the co-chairs of the MD iMap Technical Committee.*

AGENDA:

- Introductions
 - 1:00 PM – 1:05 PM (5 minutes); *actual 1:06 PM – 1:07 PM (1 minute)*
- Review of February 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes
 - 1:05 PM – 1:10 PM (5 minutes); *actual 1:07 PM – 1:12 PM (5 minutes)*
- Executive Committee Meeting Recap
 - 1:10 PM – 1:30 PM (20 minutes); *actual 1:12 PM – 1:22 PM (10 minutes)*
- Moving Forward
 - 1:30 PM – 2:45 PM (1 hour 15 minutes); *actual 1:22 PM – 2:54 PM (1 hour 32 minutes)*
- Other Business / Next Steps / Action Items
 - 2:45 PM – 3:00 PM (15 minutes); *actual 2:54 PM – 3:15 PM (21 minutes)*

ACTION ITEMS: *As defined by the MD iMap Technical Committee Chairs*

Action Items:	Date Assigned:	Follow Up By:
Next meeting for Centerline/Address Point Business Plan is scheduled for March 10 @ 1p.m. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to make sure Kenny Miller will be in attendance • Need to follow up with Kenny Miller about what proposal will be going to the Numbers Board • Strongly suggested that this documentation focus on meeting the needs of the state-level CAD system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Incentive to local organizations to move to the state system, which will have licenses and data available 	3/2/10	Co-chairs
Check with Sandi Cone about potential Centerline/Address Point documentation that might prove useful in composing the Business Plan	3/2/10	Co-chairs
Follow up with Kenny Miller concerning the Communications Plan	3/2/10	Co-chairs
Follow up with CGIS about policy & procedures documentation for Data Submission, Services Submission	3/2/10	Co-chairs
Security/Fail Over Documentation Draft – due 4/1/10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain all available documentation related to Security/Fail Over from CGIS 	3/2/10	Security Subcommittee, Co-chairs

Check with DoIT about an existing state-level Change Control Policy	3/2/10	Co-chairs, GIO
Check with DoIT about resuming an active representation at the Tech. Comm. meetings	3/2/10	Co-chairs, GIO
Follow up concerning room availability (12p.m. – 3p.m. or 1p.m. – 4p.m.) for next Tech. Comm. meeting	3/2/10	Co-chairs, Frank Siano
Comments on MOU to Graham Petto by COB 3/10/10	3/2/10	Tech. Comm.
Comments on 2/2/10 Minutes to Graham Petto by COB 3/5/10	3/2/10	Tech. Comm.
Comments on Tech. Comm. Charter to Graham Petto by COB 3/5/10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updates to this document need to consider declarations in the Executive Order 	3/2/10	Tech. Comm.
Multiple partners lawyer/attorney representatives need to be engaged to provide input and feedback toward contents of the MOU	3/2/10	Co-chairs, Tech. Comm.

MEETING NOTES:

- **TOPIC #1: Introductions (1:06 PM – 1:07 PM)**
 - *Round-the-room.*
 - Graham noted to direct any issues with the notes need to be directed to him by **COB on 03/05/10.**
- **TOPIC #2: Review of February 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes (1:07 PM – 1:12 PM)**
 - Mike Rossa – MSP
 - § Clarification on pulling money out of the Money’s Board:
 - It is a requirement that they can’t pull money out of the Money’s Board.
 - The money will be **“designated”** from that source to fund the MD iMap project.
 - The money will be used for CAD-RMS.
 - NOTHING is finalized at this time.
 - Is anyone making an effort to modernize the COMAR? (Doug Adams)
 - § ...work towards revising the funding mechanism? (Doug Adams)
 - The decision was made at the DBM / DLS – level. MSP was notified about this and was not involved in the decision. (Mike – MSP)
- **TOPIC #3: Executive Committee Meeting Recap (1:12 PM – 1:22 PM)**
 - Secretary Elliot Schlanger (DOIT) led the meeting and provided a detailed overview of the MD iMap project.
 - Graham and Julia gave a presentation on what the Technical Committee has done.
 - In regards to the Executive Committee, they noted that they can participate in handling more of the OUTREACH effort from the “top down”.
 - General discussion also focused on what applications are currently out there.
 - Julia noted:
 - § The Executive Committee was impressed on what has been accomplished with the minimal funding that is currently available.
 - § Executive Committee asked for more consolidation with efforts / funding.
 - Graham noted that customized tools and pieces developed by the Maryland Environmental Service (for example) need to be distributed to the user community.
 - § The *Application Group* will be working with MES to distribute these tools.
 - § Kevin Boone noted that we need clarification on exactly where these tools need to come from since MES has not been the only agency to develop tools.
- **TOPIC #4: Moving Forward (1:22 PM – 2:54 PM)**

- The following deliverables are expected at the April 28, 2010 MD iMap Executive Committee Meeting:
 - § Finalize Technical Committee Charter (1:22 PM – 1:36 PM)
 - Graham noted that the Executive Committee noted that they need to establish their own charter, and to that end, the Technical Committee should do the same.
 - Doug noted:
 - Certain documents, classified as being available for the Public, should be posted online.
 - The need to clarify the text for GIS vendors.
 - People should not be listed by name – but rather by agency, etc.
 - The MD iMap portal URL should be included.
 - Kevin noted that we need to update the link / URL under current item 1.5 needs to be updated.
 - Graham noted that **Chapter 2** of the document needs to be updated to reflect the Executive Order that was signed by Governor O'Malley – formally establishing the MD iMap Committees and State GIO.
 - The Technical Committee agreed with this action.
 - Graham noted in regards to membership, we need to stipulate what members we need to have within the Committee.
 - Kevin noted that this is an open Committee and all are welcome. Graham and Doug (and others) agreed to this notion.
 - Graham concluded by saying that the Charter will be updated with edits and will be re-submitted to the group for the review by/before the next Technical Committee meeting (03/16/10).
 - § State Dataset Business Plan (1:36 PM – 2:43 PM)
 - **Kevin noted that a DRAFT of this plan is due on April 28, 2010; and it should include detailed information relating to the Security aspect of the plan.**
 - Centerline March 24, 2010
 - § It was noted that Address Point go “hand-in-hand” with the Centerline dataset.
 - Imagery April 9, 2010
 - § It was noted that LiDAR was a part of the imagery acquisition.
 - § Graham noted that he is working to get a hold of the current RFP in order to present it to the Executive Committee next week.
 - Doug noted that additional documents (*which Kenny Miller has*) are needed in order to provide the Executive Committee with
 - § An attendee noted that the Centerline and Address Points datasets should be the focus, not the Imagery.
 - A few attendees agreed with this approach because it will be beneficial to the Numbers Board and E-911 efforts throughout the State of Maryland.
 - § **It was noted that strong opposition exists within the Counties that support focuses on the endorsement of the development of Road Centerlines and NOT Imagery.**
 - We need to establish a long-term agreement with the Numbers Board to fund the acquisition of Imagery every two / three years.
 - \$4 to \$4.5 million every two / three years from the Numbers Board.

§ Mike (MSP) noted that GIS support will be needed in order to develop the Road Centerline data so that it clearly integrates with their CAD system.

- Mike noted that there is an “unlimited” resource for **Subject-Matter Experts** to check the data in the future.
- Mike noted that the project will be kicked off and active in **Fall, 2010**.

§ **The group noted that the State GIO cannot go to the Numbers Board with any information UNTIL the Executive Committee signs off on it.**

- **Graham and Julia need to follow-up with Kenny on this matter.**

§ Kaushik Dutta noted that the RFP did not mention anything about the source of the road centerline data.

§ Mike (MSP) noted that the project is working out of DOIT and not MSP.

- The system does not have to exist in an MSP Server Farm.

○ **Parcels** April 21, 2010

§ Doug asked:

- Are we going to continue to develop the Business Plan so that there is a formalized, repeatable process for developing Parcels – just like the Road Centerline layer?

§ Graham noted:

- MDP has not been able to put together a formalized, repeatable process for the development of Parcels due to issues that have arisen.
 - A note was made that a process needs to be established and the Executive Committee needs to sign-off on this process.
- Doug asked:
 - Can MDP talk with CGIS to get this process established; including the storage for the dataset?
- Doug noted:
 - Next month marks three years of the Baltimore County Parcel **DATA** being up on MD iMap.
 - § The **DATA** needs to be refreshed.
- Kevin noted:
 - We DO need to have the datasets updated and updated on a regular basis so that the State (and others) can use it effectively for analysis.

- Doug asked about the other two (2) datasets that were originally included within the list of datasets:

- Address Points
- LiDAR data

- Doug noted that we need to thoroughly define each dataset within the Plan before it is sent to (1) the Numbers Board and (2) each County's E-911 center(s).
- Before moving on, it was noted that these two (2) datasets will be included back in to the list of datasets for submittal with the Plan to the Numbers Board.

- Graham noted that a SURVEY is about to be released (to E-911 Centers) focusing on retrieving information pertaining to what Centers require updates to their Road Centerline files.
 - *This effort (the Survey) was tabled.*
- Lisa (DNR) noted that the original survey has been updated, and asked for additional suggestions to the survey prior to it being sent out.
- Doug noted that “we add a Pre-Project that studies the current CAD system”.
- Mike (MSP) noted that the Police are looking at Law Enforcement Agencies CAD systems:
 - “GO-CAP” (*Organization*)
 - § Has tracked technical CAD requirements.
 - Mike noted that this effort does need to occur because it will produce a BASELINE to go off of for future efforts.
 - § For the State CAD system, Mike noted that this should be included within the presentation to the Numbers Board.
- Graham noted that we are scheduled to meet with the Centerline/Address Point Business Plan Working Group on 03/10/10 at 1 PM *after* the Executive Committee meeting.
 - *This meeting was cancelled because of a scheduling conflict.*
- Doug noted the current Business Plan does not conform to the MSGIC Business Plan – as was originally decided by the MD iMap Technical Committee.
 - Graham noted that due to timeframe changes and additional agency involvement (for example – Maryland State Police), we are going to propose the need for additional time.
 - § Cost Estimate and where we will go with funds.
- Mike (MSP) noted that the RFP should be proposed without funding.

§ Security / Fail Over Plan

- Doug noted that with the last meeting that was held with CGIS, it was noted that the CAMS package, which is used by the University (Towson), to serve as the Security package.
- The Committee noted that this is an ESSENTIAL NEED that needs to happen as soon as possible.
 - Graham noted that this is the type of issue that the Executive Committee noted that the Technical Committee needs to identify (including possible solutions) and recommend action to the Executive Committee.
- An attendee noted that **BEST PRACTICES document**, or set of documents, needs to be generated that explains Data Submission and Change Control policies for MD iMap; including update frequencies per dataset / application / tool, etc.
 - **The Committee noted documentation has been generated to date. But updates need to occur, and will occur, to the documentation by April 1, 2010.**
- *It was noted by an attendee that historically the Governor’s Office has asked for tools and data while not focusing on getting the tools and data 100% correct; i.e., Security has not been that high of a priority – as opposed to getting something out to show the Public what progress has been made.*

§ Memorandum of Understanding for Data Partnership (2:43 PM – 2:49 PM)

- Graham noted that the Executive Committee wants to see a draft of this document as soon as possible. The **Governor’s Office’s Legal Team** will be assisting with the creation of this document after a draft has been created by the Technical Committee.
 - Graham asked for comments on this document by Wednesday, March 10, 2010.

§ Web Portal / Marketing (2:49 PM – 2:54 PM)

- Kevin noted that the web portal will be launched by mid-late March, 2010.
- Kevin noted that the Governor's Office noted that consistent branding needs to occur and the current MD iMap logo generated by the Committee will not be used at this time.
- [Resources at DOIT](#)
 - Graham noted that resources from DOIT can be used to set up the Portal – as noted by Secretary Schlanger.
- [Document Management Solution](#)
- [GIS Resources](#)
- [TOPIC #5: Other Business / Next Steps / Action Items \(2:54 PM – 3:15 PM\)](#)
 - Ashley noted that metadata for some datasets has not been received to date.
 - § Additional datasets will be sent out to reinforce the need to have metadata with ALL datasets displayed on MD iMap.
 - It was noted that the email asking for the Metadata (or the data will be removed) needs to be generated by Ashley and submitted to Graham and Julia for submittal to whomever is not meeting the guidelines.
 - Ashley noted that the Data Submission Policy only currently covers GIS data, and not flat-file data that is currently used within the StateStat interface.
 - Ashley asked that the Services Submission Policy needs to be revisited during the next MD iMap Technical Committee meeting.
 - Ashley also noted that certain Services need to be removed from the MD iMap system.

-END MEETING-